

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JOHN FRANCIS MAHONEY,)	
)	CASE NO. C16-1599 RSM
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
)	
FEDERAL RESERVE ASSOCIATION, <i>et</i>)	
<i>al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Pro Se Plaintiff, John Francis Mahoney, has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this matter. Dkt. #3. The Complaint was filed on October 12, 2016. Dkt. #4. Summonses have not yet been issued.

Plaintiff brings this action against “ANY and ALL insurance, bonding and indemnification” for Federal Reserve Association and Humana Hospital West Anaheim, Saint Jude Medical Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, Bellwood General Hospital, several counties in California and Arizona, the states of California, Arizona, and Massachusetts, several federal agencies including the Department of the Treasury and the IRS, several corporations and banks, and a limited liability company. *Id.* at 5 (emphasis in original). Plaintiff’s Statement of Claim, in its entirety, is “[t]he defendants are in violation of the United States Code 15 U.S.C. 1 by monopolizing and restraining trade.” *Id.* at 2. Plaintiff also

1 attaches an affidavit setting forth his claims in greater detail. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants
2 “by operation of law via usage and mere acceptance of frn’s”¹ are in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1,
3 the Sherman Act. Dkt. # 5 at 2. Plaintiff appears to have taken the language of the Sherman
4 Act, allowing for a “fine not exceeding \$100,000,000 if a corporation,” and determined that he
5 or is family is owed that money by the various Defendants. *See id.* at 4-10 (“True Bill”). No
6 further detail is provided as to specific contracts or actions of Defendants in trade or commerce.
7

8 Plaintiff alleges that he, his family and their estates are “completely EXEMPT” from
9 civil jurisdiction “and any jurisdiction having ever used frn’s” because, *inter alia*, they have
10 never consented to that jurisdiction or entered into a valid contract submitting to that
11 jurisdiction. *Id.* at 2 (emphasis in original). Plaintiff alleges that “the Fed” has fraudulently
12 taken possession of his private property and “will NOT accept lawful tender (gold and
13 silver)...” *Id.* at 3 (emphasis in original). Plaintiff argues that “[t]he acceptance of and tender
14 of frn’s by my family, the estates and I as consideration is done merely out of necessity and/or
15 under duress” and that the use of this U.S. District Court, which he labels an “inferior court[,],”
16 is also done “merely out of necessity and/or under duress.” *Id.* Plaintiff alleges that this Court
17 has a “legal and moral duty to serve the accompanying complaint and an inferior court
18 summons... via the marshals within twenty one (21) days...” and that if this Court “fail[s] to
19 uphold their legal and moral duty... the inferior courts will then be held liable jointly and
20 severally with [Defendants]...” *Id.* at 11. Plaintiff alleges that “[t]he ONLY way that this
21 affidavit, accompanying complaint and inferior court summons can be overturned, abridged,
22 nullified, abrogated, disregarded, dismissed etc. is via a complete point for point rebuttal in
23 affidavit form...” *Id.* (emphasis in original). Plaintiff’s request for relief is for defendants to
24
25
26
27
28

¹ The Court takes Plaintiff’s acronym to stand for “federal reserve notes” based on the context in which it is used.

1 pay “the plaintiffs (sic) thirty five billion, five hundred million (35,500,000,000) (see affidavit
2 for details) in federal reserve notes or the current functional currency forthwith.” Dkt. #4 at 4.

3 The Court will dismiss a Complaint at any time if the action fails to state a claim, raises
4 frivolous or malicious claims, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from
5 such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

6
7 Plaintiff’s Complaint provides no factual basis to support his claim; the Statement of
8 Claim is a single conclusory sentence. *See* Dkt. #4 at 2. Plaintiff relies instead on his affidavit,
9 which spends more time setting forth Plaintiff’s view of his legal rights than explaining the
10 actions of Defendants that give rise to his claim. Plaintiff thus provides insufficient notice to
11 Defendants as to how they could possibly have violated the Sherman Act. Plaintiff’s apparent
12 argument that the mere use of paper currency violates the Sherman Act is unsupported by law.
13 Plaintiff’s request for \$35,500,000,000 appears frivolous on its face. Plaintiff asserts several
14 propositions for which there is no legal authority, and appears to set forth his own rules of civil
15 procedure. Considering all of the above, Plaintiff’s Complaint thus appears frivolous and
16 destined to seek relief against defendants who are immune from such relief. Accordingly,
17 dismissal may be warranted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

18
19
20 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Complaint may suffer from deficiencies that, if not adequately
21 explained in response to this Order, will require dismissal. In Response to this Order, Plaintiff
22 must write a short and plain statement telling the Court: (1) the actions of Defendants giving
23 rise to Plaintiff’s claims; (2) how those actions violate 15 U.S.C. § 1, the Sherman Act. **This**
24 **Response may not exceed five (5) pages, including attachments.** The Court will not
25 consider pages filed in excess of this limit.
26
27
28

1 The Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to
2 Show Cause containing the detail above **no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of**
3 **this Order**. Failure to file this Response may result in dismissal of this case. The Clerk shall
4 send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff's address, C/O KATE MAHONEY 7003 MERCURY
5 DRIVE LAKESIDE, AZ 85929.
6

7
8 DATED this 13th day of October 2016.
9

10 

11 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
12 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28